*Mr. H. Krishna Sastri* stated that the inamdars should follow the enlightened policy of Government and treat their raiyats in the same way as raiyats in Government villages are treated, and that they should take only a share of the revenue of the village.

*Mr. K. Krishna Murti Rao* represented that as several of the villages were *becharak* at the time of their grant to the inamdars, they had to spend a large sum of money to attract settlers and improve the villages and as such Government should not interfere with the relation between the inamdars and their tenants. He said that the inamdars are the raiyats of Government and cannot arrogate the powers and duties of Government nor its beneficent activities. He suggested the appointment of a Committee for each district, as the nature of inam tenure differed in the several districts. He said he would arrange for a Conference of all inamdars after knowing the policy of Government in the matter.

One of the members complained that the inamdars did not issue pattas to their raiyats.

*Mr. Sura Sastri* was opposed to the issue of pattas on the ground that such a step would make the raiyats neglect the cultivation of the batayi lands in the village and therefore suggested that only temporary leases might be granted to them. He was also opposed to the introduction of Survey and Settlement if it should lead to loss of revenue. The introduction of Survey and Settlement into villages the jodi of which was equal to survey assessment and grant of occupancy right were in his opinion very disadvantageous to the inamdars.

On the other hand, one of the members proposed that greater facilities should be afforded to the raiyats of inam villages to secure occupancy rights.

It was also pointed out that it was against the interests of inamdars to harass the raiyats and that ordinarily they were quite considerate.

The inamdar members said that they would hold a conference and submit their resolutions and then Government might consider the question of appointing a Commission.

*Reply of Government.*—The question of appointing a Commission will be further considered in the light of the discussion in the Assembly.

SUBJECT No. 54.

Allotment of *gomal* lands.

Mr. M. Ramaswami Sastri, Yedatore taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—As per Land Revenue Rules, 30 acres of land are required to be set apart for every 100 head of cattle. In many places where *nalas* run, there is hardly any *gomal* land. The grant of land for cultivation purposes out of *gomal* area should be discouraged and a committee appointed to investigate the question of the sufficiency or otherwise of the *gomal* land for each village.

*Reply of Government.*—Special cases will be investigated.

SUBJECT No. 55.

Disposal of applications for *gomal* lands.

Messrs. Vembralliah, Byrè Gowda and Doddarame Gowda, Kolar taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—The raiyats put in darkhasts for *gomal* lands owing to the insufficiency of assessed lands. As these applications are not disposed of promptly, the Deputy Commissioners may be empowered to finally dispose of such cases.

*Reply of Government.*—Under consideration.

SUBJECT No. 56.

Remission of land revenue.

Messrs. Herur Gundappa, Kunigal taluk, Ibrahim Khan, Sira taluk, Agali Venkataramiah, Tumkur District Board, Singri Nanjappa, Tiptur taluk, Anjaneya Setti, Pavagada taluk, Huśchaveere Gowda and K. Ramanuja Iyengar, Gubbi taluk, and Sanjivappa, Koratagere sub-taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—(*a*) *Tari banjar* remission may be sanctioned for lands behind tanks which do not fill in any year, and

(*b*) remission may be granted when crops fail for want of rains.

*Reply of Government.*—Will be investigated.

SUBJECT No. 57.

A training school for patels.

Mr. Ramanna, Chitaldrug District Board.

*Summary of discussion.*—Several of the patels are illiterate and those that are literate possess poor knowledge. Their duties involve heavy responsibility concerning various branches of the administration. Schools may therefore be opened for training these men.

*Reply of Government.*—Will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 58.

Levy of water rate by Government from raiyats of inam villages instead of from inamdars.

Mr. Raghavachar, Pavagada taluk.

*Note.*—Not discussed owing to the absence of the proposer.

SUBJECT No. 59.

Reduction of raiyats' contribution for restoration of minor tanks.

Messrs. (*a*) Krishnappa and Channabasappa Gowda, Sorab taluk, and (*b*) Surasastri, Chikballapur taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—(*a*) Same concessions are allowed both for maidan and malnad in regard to the raiyats' share of contribution for the restoration of the minor tanks. Malnad people being decidedly poorer, many tanks are not restored for want of raiyats' share of one-third of their contribution. The raiyats' share of contribution may be reduced to one-fourth in their case.

(*b*) In the Representative Assembly of 1914, it was assured that the raiyats would be asked to pay only one-third of the cost of earth work for repairs to minor tanks. But Government have passed orders that the raiyats should pay one-third of the total cost of the repairs.

*Mr. Sura Sastri* of Chikballapur stated that under the old rules the raiyats were liable only for earthwork, while under the new rules they were liable for a share of both the earthwork and the stone work and that this was hard.

*Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao* pointed out that the members had agreed to the rules before they were issued.

*Mr. Girimaji Rao* of Kolar represented the difficulty caused by the rule directing that tanks costing more than